REMARKS

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

In response to the rejection, Applicant has canceled claim 23 and has amended the specification (Paragraph [0024]) by adding the words "in size" to literally emphasize that "the diffusion dots in the scatter enhancing regions are larger in size than that of the diffusion dots in a remaining region of the bottom surface adjacent to the scatter enhancing regions", which is a limitation of claim 1. Support of the amendment can be found in the original specification, claims, and drawings, for example, in FIGS. 1 and 4. Therefore, Applicant submits that the rejection is now overcome. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claim 1-3, 5-7, 10, 11, 15 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohkawa (US 6,671,013B1).

In response to the rejection, Applicant has canceled claim 23, has kept claims 1-3, 5-7, 10, 11, 15 and 23 unchanged, and hereby otherwise traverses the rejection thereof.

Independent claim 1, as previously amended, recites, in part:

> "wherein a plurality of substantially triangular scatter enhancing regions is defined on the bottom surface adjacent to the light sources, and **sizes of the diffusion dots in the scatter enhancing regions are larger than that of the diffusion dots in a remaining region of the bottom surface adjacent to the scatter enhancing regions.**" (Emphasis added).

Ohkawa does disclose (Column 8 Lines 21-25) that the projections 20 are arranged in corner areas C, D of the light guide plate 30, near to the electrode portions EL1, EL2, at a specially large density. However, a large density need not necessarily require the size of the projections in corner areas C, D to be larger than in any other areas. In fact, the individual diffusion dots of Ohkawa, as presented in various Figures (including FIG. 6), all appear to be approximately the same size.

As such, Ohkawa appears to rely on a difference in the number of dots in a given area to achieve a variance in dot density, not upon the sizes of the dots themselves. In other words, the Ohkawa reference is silent about any sort of variation in the dot size. As such, Ohkawa fails to expressly or inherently disclose or suggest that "the sizes of the dots in the scatter enhancing /darker regions ARE LARGER THAN those of the diffusion dots in a remaining region of the bottom surface adjacent to the scatter enhancing regions", as set forth in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Ohkawa '013, taken alone or in combination with any of the other cited references, fails to teach or suggest

the surface light source unit set forth in claim 1, as previously amended. Claim 1, as currently provided, is thus submitted to be in condition for allowance, and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7, 10, 11, 14 and 15 depend from claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby submits that claims 2-7, 10, 11, 14, and 15 are in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is hereby respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkawa (US 6,671,013) in view of Ishikawa (US 5,921,651).

Claim 4 depends directly from claim 1, which is in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 4 is now in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is hereby respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkawa (US 6,671,013) and Ohkawa (US 6,755,546).

Claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 depend directly from claim 1, which is in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 are now in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is hereby respectfully requested.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkawa (US 6,671,013).

Claim 14 depends directly from claim 1, which is in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 14 is now in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is hereby respectfully requested.

Argument to New Matter

Examiner asserts that, in page 6 of the present Office Action, Applicant's claim 1 includes new subject matter not previous disclosed. Applicant traverses this assertion as the following reasons.

As Examiner himself describes in page 6 lines 2-3, Applicant's initial language of "the diffusion dots in the scatter enhancing regions are larger than..." could be interpreted to mean that "the diffusion dots in the scatter enhancing regions are larger in size than...". Applicant hereby thanks for Examiner's precise consideration, and asserts that "the diffusion dots in the scatter enhancing regions are larger in size than..." has been inherently disclosed in the original claim 1. Applicant further notes, as set forth in, e.g., Paragraph [0024] and claim 1, each as originally presented, it is expressly provided that certain diffusion dots are to be larger than other diffusion dots. Accordingly, the only reasonable interpretation here is that it is the size of individual dots within such subsets that is intended, not for the space occupied by a group of such dots. Applicants particularly submit

that, as clearly shown in Figs. 1 and 4, the individual diffusion dots 36 in regions 425 are larger than those dots 36 in the main areas immediately adjacent the regions 425, which is consistent with the description given thereof, e.g., in Paragraph [0010] and in lines 15-17 of Paragraph [0024]. Accordingly, Applicant submits that there is sufficient support in the specification, as originally filed, for the subject matter of claim 1, as currently presented.

Further, it should be noted that Applicant's initial language in claim 1 is "...the diffusion dots in the scatter enhancing regions are larger than the diffusion dots in a remaining region of the bottom surface **adjacent to the scatter enhancing regions**". It is clear that Applicant emphasizes a remaining region of the bottom surface that is **adjacent to the scatter enhancing regions, not the whole remaining region of the bottom surface.**

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1, as previously amended, DOESN'T INCLUDE any new matter not originally disclosed. Reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the present application as defined in the pending claims is considered to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Chuan-De Huang

By _____

Jeffrey T. Knapp
Registration No.: 45,384
Foxconn International, Inc.
1650 Memorex Drive,
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel. No.: 714/626-1229